

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01363 01 OF 02 121441Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 USIE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00

EB-07 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 /089 W

----- 009925

O P 121210Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 576

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ROME

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1363

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FLANK SECURITY

REF: A) MBFR VIENNA 86

B) USNATO 5200 DTG 242030Z SEP 74 (NOTAL)

C) USNATO 1057 DTG 261417Z FEB 75 (NOTAL)

SUMMARY: THIS MESSAGE COMMENTS ON THE SPECIFIC NEW APPROACH  
TO FLANK SECURITY RECOMMENDED BY VIENNA IN REF A. MISSION  
CONSIDERS THAT U.S. IS NOT UNDER TIME PRESSURE TO PUT FOR-  
WARD A NEW PROPOSAL IN THE NEAR FUTURE. MISSION BELIEVES  
REF A FORMULATION ON HUNGARY WOULD HELP MEET ITALIAN CONCERNS.  
HOWEVER, IT WOULD WHET THE APPETITE OF THE FLANK COUNTRIES  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01363 01 OF 02 121441Z

FOR SIMILAR LANGUAGE THAT WITHDRAWN FORCES WOULD NOT REDE-  
PLOY TOAREAS CONTIGUOUS TO THE FLANKS. AT SAME TIME, THE OTHER  
FORMULATION IN REF A, THE FORMULATION ON THE FLANKS WOULD NOT  
MEET FLANK INTERESTS AS WELL AS THE PRESENT SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE

(WITH GENERAL BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS), WHICH U.S. HAS ALREADY ACCEPTED. MISSION BELIEVES THAT ANY NEW U.S. EFFORT ON FLANK SECURITY SHOULD FOCUS ON THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE, WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY NARROWED THE FORMERLY WIDE DIVERSITY OF VIEWS, SHOULD SEEK TO PROMOTE THAT TEXT WITH THE GENERAL BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS AND SHOULD START WITH ITALY.

1. MISSION HAS PREVIOUSLY NOTED THAT PROGRESS ON FLANK SECURITY MIGHT HAVE SOME VALUE IN ADVANCING U.S. POSITIONS IN CERTAIN OTHER AREAS OF MBFR. HOWEVER, MISSION BELIEVES THAT THE U.S. IS NOT UNDER TIME PRESSURE TO PUT FORWARD A NEW PROPOSAL ON THIS SUBJECT IN THE NEAR FUTURE. THE MOST VOCAL COUNTRY ON FLANK SECURITY WITHIN THE ALLIANCE HAS BEEN TURKEY. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THE U.S. IS NOT NOW IN A POSITION OF CONFRONTATION WITH TURKEY ON THIS ISSUE. RATHER THE U.S. AND TURKEY CAN BOTH SUPPORT THE SAME FORMULATION, THAT CONTAINED IN THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE TO THE AHG (REF B), INCLUDING THE GENERAL BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS WHERE FORCES WITHDRAWN FROM NGA SHALL NOT REDEPLOY, ALTHOUGH TURKEY PREFERS THE ITALIAN ALTERNATIVE ALNLANGUAGE DEFINING THOSE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS AS CONTIGUOUS TO TERRITORY OF NGA AND INDIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

2. THE FORMULATION ON HUNGARY IN PARAS 8 AND 16, REF A, WOULD FORBID SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES OF U.S. AND SOVIET COMBAT FORCES IN TERRITORY OF SPICAL STATUS PARTICIPANTS "ADJACENT TO" THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. MISSION BELIEVES THIS FORMULATION WOULD HELP MEET ITALIAN CONCERNS ABOUT HANDLING HUNGARY IN A WAY WHICH WOULD NOT INCLUDE ITALY IN MBFR, AND WOULD HELP FACILITATE ITALIAN AGREEMENT ON A FLANK FORMULATION SATISFACTORY TO THE U.S. HOWEVER, WE BELEIVE THIS FORMULATION WOULD CAUSE PROBLEMS WITH THE FLANK COUNTRIES. THESE COUNTRIES WOULD BE CONCERNED THAT THE FORMULATION ON HUNGARY IN PRECISELY DEFINING THE GEOGRAPHIC AREAS ADJACENT TO THE REDUCTIONS AREA WHERE WITHDRAWN FORCES WOULD NOT REDEPLOY, WOULD MAKE MORE WITHDRAWN SOVIET TROOPS AVAILABLE FOR DEPLOYMENT TO THE FLANKS. THE FLANK COUNTRIES HAVE NOT ACCEPTED THE ARGUMENTS THE U.S. HAS  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01363 01 OF 02 121441Z

USED (ESSENTIALLY THOSE IN PARA 15, REF A) AGAINST PRECISELY DEFINING GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, ALTHOUGH THEY UNDERSTAND THE FIRMNESS OF THE U.S. POSITION, AND THEY WOULD NOT UNDERSTAND WHY THE U.S. COULD NOW ACCEPT THIS LANGUAGE FOR SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS ADJACENT TO THE REDUCTIONS AREA, BUT NOT FOR FLANK COUNTRIES. THE FORMULATION ON HUNGARY WOULD THUS, IN MISSION'S VIEW, ENCOURAGE FLANK COUNTRIES, INCLUDING TURKEY, TO SUPPORT EVEN MORE STRONGLY A PRECISE DEFINITION OF AREAS ADJACENT TO THE FLANKS WHERE WITHDRAWN TROOPS WOULD NOT REDEPLOY, ALONG THE LINES OF THE ITALIAN LANGUAGE IN THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE.

3. THE FORMULATION ON FLANK SECURITY, IN PARAS 7 AND 14 OF REF A, WOULD SERVE U.S. INTERESTS WELL. HOWEVER, THE FLANK

FORMULATION IN THE PRESENT SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE, WHICH THE U.S. HAS ACCEPTED (WITH THE GENERAL BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS), GOES FURTHER TOWARD MEETING FLANK CONCERNS THAN THIS FORMULATION. THE FLANK COUNTRIES MIGHT CONSIDER REF A FORMULATION ON FLANK SECURITY AS A RETURN TO THE EARLIER U.S. FORMULATIONS WHICH THE FLANK COUNTRIES FOUND INADEQUATE.

4. PART II OF THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE CONTAINS TWO PRINCIPAL ELEMENTS WHICH REPRESENTED AN ADVANCE OVER EARLIER U.S. FORMULATIONS FROM THE FLANK VIEWPOINT. THE FIRST OF THESE ELEMENTS IS THE SENTENCE: "THE U.S. AND USSR UNDERTAKE TO REFRAIN FROM ANY ACTION (E.G. REDEPLOYMENT OF FORCES) INFRINGING UPON EITHER THE SPIRIT OR THE LETTER OF THIS AGREEMENT." REFERENCE TO "ANY ACTION" IN THIS MANNER WAS DESIGNED TO ENABLE FLANKS TO BACK OFF FROM THEIR EARLIER INSISTENCE THAT THE FORMULATION SPECIFICALLY FORBID MOVEMENTS OF "OTHER THAN WITHDRAW FORCES" TO AREAS BORDERING THE FLANKS (I.E. WHERE SOVIETS TRANSFER FORCES FROM NGA TO SMOLENSK, FOR EXAMPLE, FREEING FORCES STATIONED IN SMOLENSK TO MOVE TO THE TURKISH BORDER). THE SECOND ELEMENT IS THE REFERENCE TO NON-REDEPLOYMENT OF WITHDRAWN FORCES "IN GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS WHERE THEIR ADDED PRESENCE --- ETC." THIS PHRASE REPRESENTED FIRST U.S. ACCEPTANCE OF REFERENCE TO "GEOGRAPHIC REGION". THIS U.S. MOVEMENT WAS NOTED BY FLANK COUNTRIES EVEN THOUGH U.S. DID NOT WISH TO DEFINE GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS FURTHER.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 01363 02 OF 02 121532Z

50

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 EB-07

ACDE-00 ERDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 USIE-00 /089 W

----- 010891

O P 121210Z MAR 75 ZFF4

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0577

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ROME

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1363

5. PART II OF THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE ALSO CONTAINS AN ELEMENT OF IMPORTANCE TO THE NETHERLANDS, I.E. THE PHRASE THAT DEPLOYMENT OF WITHDRAWN TROOPS SHOULD NOT "CIRCUMVENT THE OBJECTIVE PURSUED IN THIS AGREEMENT OF ENHANCING STABILITY AND SECURITY IN EUROPE." THIS PHRASE PARTIALLY ACCOMMODATED INITIAL A DUTCH INSISTENCE THAT ALLIES HANDLE FLANK SECURITY AND GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION TOGETHER IN ORDER NOT TO DOWNGRADE THE LATTER. (THE PHRASE QUOTED ABOVE IS IN TURN COUNTERBALANCED BY PARAS 3 D-E OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE IN REF B, WHICH INSTRUCTS AHG TO IDENTIFY THE FORMULATION AS THE ALLIED POSITION ON FLANK SECURITY RPT FLANK SECURITY, AND TO TELL THE FACT THAT THE ALLIES WILL MAKE PROPOSALS ON GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION CONCERNS AT A LATER DATE.) THE DUTCH NOW AGREE TO THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, INCLUDING THE BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, BUT WITH THE SECOND SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01363 02 OF 02 121532Z

BRACKETED SENTENCE IN PARA 3D, MAKING TIMING OF ITS USE WITH OTHER SIDE DEPENDENT ON NAC DECISION.

6. MISSION THINKS THE U.S. SHOULD CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE PRESENT DRAFT GUIDANCE, ISD/80 (2ND REVISION) CONTAINED IN REF B. THIS DOCUMENT IS A COMPROMISE AMONG POSITIONS INTRODUCED OVER A PERIOD OF SEVERAL MONTHS BY BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS, GREECE, TURKEY, U.S., FRG, UK AND ITALY. THE DOCUMENT NARROWS THE PREVIOUSLY WIDE DIVERSITY OF VIEWS DOWN TO TWO, DISAGREED, BRACKETED SECTIONS. AN APPROACH UNRELATED TO THIS DOCUMENT WOULD REOPEN A NUMBER OF OLD ISSUES, SOME OF WHICH ARE NOTED ABOVE.

7. MISSION BELIEVES BEST PROSPECT FOR PROGRESS ON FLANK SECURITY AT THE PRESENT TIME LIES IN AN EFFORT TO SELL THE TEXT IN REF B WITH THE BELGIAN LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS, AND TO START THIS EFFORT WITH ITALY, WHICH AS NOTED IN PARA 9, REFC, DOES NOT SEEM TO HAVE A STRONG INTEREST IN MAINTAINING ITS ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE ON GEOGRAPHIC AREAS AS LONG AS THE PROBLEM OF HUNGARY CAN BE SOLVED IN ANOTHER CONTEXT WITHOUT INCLUSION OF ITALY IN MBFR.

8. MISSION WISHES TO NOTE CERTAIN MINOR CHANGES CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENT "CORRIGENDUM, ISD/80 (2ND REVISION), OCTOBER 1, 1974," AND NOT COVERED IN THE TEXT IN PARA 2 REF B. IN THE ITALIAN SECOND BRACKETED SENTENCE IN PART II OF THE TEXT, CHANGE "AREAS ADJACENT" TO "AREAS CONTIGUOUS", AND CHANGE "IN A MANNER WHICH" TO "WHERE THEIR ADDED PRESENCE." IN FOOTNOTE 2 TO PART II, IN THE FOURTH AND FIFTH LINES, CHANGE "THE DELEGATION" TO "ONE DELEGATION", AND IN THE FINAL SENTENCE OF THAT FOOTNOTE CHANGE "THE DELEGATION" TO "THE SAME DELEGATION."  
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 12 MAR 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO01363  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750398/abbrziru.tel  
**Line Count:** 217  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A) MBFR VIENNA 86 B) USNATO 5200 DTG 242030Z SEP 74 (NOTAL) C) USNATO 1057 DTG 261417Z FEB 75 (NOTAL)  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by KelleyW0>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: FLANK SECURITY  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
ATHENS  
BONN  
COPENHAGEN  
LONDON

OSLO  
ROME  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006